1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The parties, by and through their undersigned respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

- 1. The Court previously entered an Order (ECF No. 91) providing guidance to the parties with respect to appropriate redactions for filings made in connection with the Motion to Stay Action and related filings, which reference the scope, substance, subject matter or direction of an ongoing criminal investigation.
- 2. On January 10, 2024, the Court held oral argument on the Motion to Stay Action, among other filings.
- 3. The Court allowed provisional sealing of the Transcript of Proceedings so the parties could meet and confer on whether redactions were necessary and, if so, whether they could agree on those redactions.
- 4. The parties have since met and conferred.
- 5. The parties have agreed upon certain redactions to the Transcript of Proceedings as reflected in Exhibit "1" attached to this Stipulation and Order.
- 6. Subject to the Court's approval, the parties stipulate and request that the Redacted Version of the Transcript of Proceedings, attached hereto as Exhibit "1," be filed by the Clerk as the publicly available version of the Transcript of Proceedings from the January 10, 2024 court hearing in this matter.
- 7. The parties submit that the proposed reductions comply with the requirements of the Court's prior Order (ECF No. 91) and the relevant case law. Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97 (9th Cir. 2016) (applying good cause standard); Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (applying compelling reasons standard).
- 8. Because the proposed redactions only reference the direction or scope of the ongoing criminal investigation, there does not appear to be a public interest in the redacted information that outweighs the need for its protection.

9. Further, the redactions are limited in nature and will not hinder the public's ability to 1 understand the judicial process in relation to this dispute. 2 3 DATED: this 6th day of February, 2024 DATED: this 6th day of February, 2024 4 **CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS** RICE REUTHER SULLIVAN & CARROLL, LLP 5 By: /s/ Anthony J. DiRaimondo By: /s/ Philip S. Erwin 6 Anthony J. DiRaimondo, Esq. Philip R. Erwin, Esq. 7 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway 710 South Seventh Street, Suite A Suite 1200 Las Vegas, NV 89101 8 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 LNW Gaming, Inc. f/k/a SG Gaming, Inc. 9 f/k/a Bally Gaming, Inc. -and-10 Chad W. Flansburg, Esq. (Pro Hac Vice) 11 28 Éast Main Street Suite 1400 12 Rochester, New York 14614-1935 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant RES 14 Exhibit Services, LLC and 15 Counterdefendants James Leonardo and Robert Reyes 16 17 DATED: this 6th day of February, 2024 18 **HOLLAND & HART LLP** 19 By: /s/ Erica C. Medley 20 Erica C. Medley, Esq. 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor 21 Las Vegas, NV 89134 22 ecmedley@hollandart.com Attorneys for Counterdefendant 23 Jeri Wiedemer 24 **ORDER** 25 26 27 UNITED STATES 28

IT IS SO ORDERED: Dated: February 6, 2024 3